

Serial No. 10/792,159
Amendment dated May 25, 2006
Reply to Office Action dated April 26, 2006

Amendments to the Drawings

The attached six sheets of substitute drawings are submitted. Entry of the substitute sheets is solicited.

Attachment: Six substitute sheets

Serial No. 10/792,159
Amendment dated May 25, 2006
Reply to Office Action dated April 26, 2006

REMARKS

The issues raised in the Office Action are discussed in the order presented.

OBJECTION TO THE DRAWINGS/\$112 CLAIMS REJECTIONS

The Office Action indicates that the "slots at one (or each) finger have lower ends located at different levels" is not shown in the drawings, and hence objects to the drawings. Additionally, the Office Action rejects claims 4 and 6 under Section 112 as failing to comply with the enablement requirement for failing to describe in the specification "the description of the lower ends of the finger or fingers being located at different levels."

Attention is directed to page 15 paragraph 2 which reads in part:

The fingers and slots to either side of the central finger 144 and slot 146 are tilted away from the central finger and slot proportional to the distance from the central finger and slot so that the *finger bases and the lower ends of the slots lie on lines 154 and 156* with the inner end of the slot and finger base located above the outer end of the slot and finger base. (*emphasis added*)

Serial No. 10/792,159
Amendment dated May 25, 2006
Reply to Office Action dated April 26, 2006

A slot with lower ends at different levels are clearly described in this paragraph and shown in Figure 12. Applicant respectfully requests that the objection to the drawings and the rejection of the claims be withdrawn.

\$103 CLAIMS REJECTIONS

Claims 1-3, 11, 12, 15, 17-24 and 27 are rejected under Section 103 as being obvious over Palla U.S. Patent No. 1,955,252.

Claims 7-10, 26, 29-31, and 37-40 are are rejected under Section 103 as being obvious over Palla U.S. Patent No. 1,955,252 in view of Schoenfisch U.S. Patent No. 2,995,256.

Applicant has amended the claims to distinguish from the art of record and requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection in view of the following.

Response to Rejections

Applicant notes with appreciation the indication that dependent claims 5, 25, 28 and 32 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form.

Independent claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the limitations of allowable claim 5 and delete the "flat" limitation. Claim 5 has been canceled. Allowance of claim 1 and dependent claims 2-4 and 6-18 is solicited.

Serial No. 10/792,159
Amendment dated May 25, 2006
Reply to Office Action dated April 26, 2006

Independent claim 19 has been amended to incorporate the limitations of allowable claim 25 and claim 25 has been canceled. Allowable claim 28 has been rewritten in independent form. Allowance of claims 19-24 and 26-28 is solicited.

Independent claim 29 has been amended to incorporate the limitations of allowable claim 32 and claim 32 has been canceled. Allowance of claims 29-31 and 33-40 is solicited.

Remaining claims 41-48 are allowed.

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully submits all claims are now allowed or in form for allowance and the application is in condition for formal allowance. Such action is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Robert C. Berfield

By Charles A. Hooker
Charles A. Hooker, Esq.
Reg. No. 58,129

Hooker & Habib, P.C.
100 Chestnut St., Ste. 304
Harrisburg, PA 17101
(717) 232-8771